DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 285 646 PS 016 611

AUTHOR Goldfine, Eleanor; Wagner, Mary Lou
TITLE A Study of the Effectiveness of a Latchkey Program in Middletown Township, New Jersey.
INSTITUTION Brookdale Community Coll., Lincroft, NJ. Center for Educational Research.
PUB DATE Apr 87
NOTE 42p.
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *After School Programs; Elementary Education; Employed Parents; Enrichment Activities; Extracurricular Activities; *Latchkey Children; Parent Attitudes; *School Age Day Care; Student Attitudes

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study was to measure the impact of an after-school child care program on the academic and social development of children in grades one through five. The project had three objectives: (1) to measure and compare the academic achievement of the students before and after their enrollment in the program; (2) to evaluate the social development of the students while enrolled in the program; and (3) to evaluate parents' perceptions of the need for the program. All the students registered for the program (140 from two schools in the district) were subjects of the study. Pre- and post-measures were to be administered. The four measures used included (1) academic grades and test scores, (2) assessments of parents' perceptions of the program, (3) teacher ratings of pupil academic self-esteem, and (4) student self-evaluations of affective perceptions. The initial data were collected, but due to lack of funds the after-school program was discontinued at mid-year. Students selected by random sampling were interviewed concerning their attitudes towards the program after their participation. The data collected indicated that the program was viewed in a positive way by both parents and children, with high expectations on the part of parents and praise by the students for the results. Four appendices conclude this document and contain: (1) parent assessment latch-key program form; (2) student interviews; (3) study results of students from the Lincroft Elementary School; and (4) study results of students from the East Keansburg Elementary School. (PCB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

A Study of the Effectiveness of a Latchkey Program in Middletown Township, New Jersey

by
Eleanor Goldfine and Mary Lou Wagner

April 1987

BROOKDALE COMMUNITY COLLEGE

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Mary Lou Wagner

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

CENTER FOR EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH

A Study of the Effectiveness of a New Latchkey Program in Middletown Township, New Jersey

by

Eleanor Goldfine and Mary Lou Wagner

for

The Center for Educational Research

April 1987

Acknowledgements

The following individuals are to be thanked for their cooperation and participation in the Latchkey study: George Ehlers, principal of the Lincroft Elementary school; Debbie Baker, Latchkey coordinator in Lincroft; Frank J. Vacarelli, principal of the East Keansburg elementary school; and Michelle Dumford, the East Keansburg coordinator. Also, the teachers for the program; the Brookdale education interns and classroom teachers who assisted with the data collection; and Terri Healy, the research consultant for statistics. In addition, a special note of thanks goes to Dr. Frank Paoni, Director of the Center for Educational Research at Brookdale Community College, for initiating the project.

Concern has resurfaced for the "latchkey children," a population identified several times in the past. The term dates back to the nineteenth century when children left on their own wore their housekeys around their necks as their parents went to work in the new factories; also, during World War II when their fathers were in military service and their mothers took jobs in the defense plants. Today, the term has reemerged as mothers, under pressure of women's liberation goals and economic needs, have joined the employed ranks in ever increasing numbers.

Over 60% of all mothers are now part of the work force. (Bureau of Census, 1985) Most of them are away from the house from 8 a.m. to 5 p.m. Schools normally operate from 8:30 a.m. until 3 p.m. The conflict in these two schedules means that children are at home unsupervised an hour or more each morning and two to three hours each afternoon, spending a total of fifteen hours a week without adult supervision. This is particularly noteable for children between the ages of 7 and 13.

Parents and child care specialists are concerned for these children. They wonder if they feel abandoned, frightened and insecure; if they suffer from a lack of adult guidance and support; and if they are inclined to act badly.

A few studies have been done to determine what impact these hours alone have upon children. An early study (Woods, 1972) discovered that unsupervised 5th grade girls

in Philadelphia scored lower in school achievement and school relations. Long and Long (1982) reported higher levels of fear among unsupervised children living in Washington, D.C. Galambos and Garbarino (1983) in comparing two groups in a rural area, found no significant differences between the supervised and unsupervised on measures of achievement, classroom orientation, fear level and teacher-rated school adjustment. Another study done in a consolidated school district in North Carolina did not note any social and psychological differences between those left alone and those with adult supervision (Rodman, Pratto and Nelson, 1985). The data in these few studies is inconclusive. The major differences seem to be based more upon the area in which the children live, rather than upon adult supervision or lack of it.

Despite this disparity in data, the increase in the number of unsupervised children from all socio-economic brackets has heightened concern for the safety and mental attitudes of these children. Social problems surrounding the latchkey syndrome include delinquency and crime-related activities.

Children can be exposed to a variety of negative activities including drug experimentation, sex abuse, and neighborhood crime. Or they can be lonely, glued to the TV set for too many hours, and have too many household responsibilities with little or no opportunity to be carefree and interact with their peers.

Certainly, a better alternative would be for children to be part of a well-organized adult-supervised child care program. There are a variety of existing possibilities, such as private businesses and industries providing their own in-house extended care centers, or local groups, such as the YMCA, offering before and after-school care for children of the community.

In addition, many day-care specialists have advocated the establishment of school-based programs for latchkey children, using the local schools as centers. Extended supervision in the neighborhood schools offer children and parents quality care on the school premises, including extra help with homework, as well as opportunities for extra curricular activities such as art, computers, and sports. Parents worry less about their children when they know they are in an adult-supervised situation. Children feel less isolated and more secure. Their time becomes more productive when they engage in well-organized and well-supervised activities (Cooke and Mills, 1983).

Since the late 70's more and more school districts have started such programs. By 1977, the Arlington, Virginia school system had 21 schools and 1,000 students involved in a latchkey project; and by 1978 Brookline, Massachusetts had 358 students participating. Today, the numbers have expanded. The city of Cambridge, Massachusetts offers a program in 12 schools for 255 students. There are 9 schools and 200 students in a program in Lansing, Michigan. And at present the Houston school district has 24 magnet schools offering both before and after school care (Wagner, M.L., 1987).

Since these latchkey programs are fairly new, there is a need for research to assess their effectiveness. Are the parents and students benefiting, and do the school districts view the influence upon their students as positive? Unfortunately, a review of the literature has not uncovered this kind of data.

This past year, a school district in Middletown Township, New Jersey, started a new latchkey program and requested that such an evaluation be made. The officials did not want to invest in an after-school project unless they knew that it was needed and would be beneficial to both their school district and to the students and their parents.

In response to this need for data, the educational research center at Brookdale Community College volunteered to conduct a study for them. The project was developed by Eleanor Goldfine, Learning Assistant in Education and Psychology, and Dr. Mary Lou Wagner, Associate Professor of Sociology. It was decided to focus on a study that would attempt to measure the impact of an after-school program on both the academic and social development of the children with the hypothesis being that the children would benefit both academically and socially from the experience. The project was to have three objectives: 1) To measure and compare the academic achievement of the students before and after their enrollment in the program; 2) To evaluate the social development of the students while enrolled in the program; and 3) To evaluate the parents' perceptions of the

need for the program.

Method

Sample

There were two schools in the district which were to be included in the project, both beginning new latchkey programs. All of the students registering for the program were to be included as subjects, a total of 140 (41 and 99 in the respective schools). These children were between the ages of 6 and 11, grades 1-5. Each student was identified by a number, rather than by name, for the purpose of the study.

Measures

The study was to consist of pre- and post- measures of the academic and social development of the children. Evaluations were to be made as the students began the program in the fall of the year, and again at the end of the year. The expectation was that there should be some measureable improvement in behaviors and attitudes if the after-school program had made a positive impact upon the participants.

Four different measures were to be included: 1) Academic grades and test scores; 2) An assessment of the parents' perceptions of the program; 3) A teacher rating of pupil academic self-esteem; and 4) A student self-evaluation of affective perceptions.

Two commercial instruments were selected for use: The Behavioral Academic Self-Esteem Rating Scale by

Coopersmith and Gilberts for the academic rating; and the Affective perception Inventory by Soares and Soares for the affective self-evaluation. The parent questionnaire was developed especially for the study. It included such questions as: What were your child-care arrangements prior to this program; and what expectations do you have for the program. Also, it contained questions regarding the parents' perception of the childrens' attitudes toward school, homework, self-esteem, etc. (See Appendix A)

Procedures

The data was collected with the cooperation of the staff involved in the program (which included education interns from Brookdale), as well as the students' classroom teachers. The academic grades and tests scores were to be obtained from the students' permanent records. The parent questionnaires were to be sent home with the children. The classroom teachers were asked to respond to the academic self-esteem rating scale. And the student affective inventory was to be completed for each child with the help of the interns.

It was planned that the data would be collected during the first two weeks of the program, and again at the end of the year. One additional piece of information was to be obtained after the program was in operation for two months, brief taped interviews with a sampling of students. They were to be asked how they liked the program, and if they would like to do anything differently.

With the exception of the academic records, the initial data was collected as planned. The collection process took four weeks instead of the planned two weeks, with the usual problems of getting responses back on time, lost forms, etc. Also, with some of the students dropping out, the final study numbered 109 subjects, rather than the original 140.

Results

Unfortunately, the study could not be completed as described in the methodology. In order to evaluate the changes in the students, it was important to make both pre- and post-measures, but due to a lack of funds, the school district was unable to continue the program for the second half of the year following the Christmas break, making it impossible to do the necessary comparisons.

It was felt, however, that it would be appropriate to analyze two parts of the data as it was collected, the parent responses on the initial questionnaires and the student interviews. Even without pre- and post-comparisons, the responses of the parents and their children should provide some insights into the value of the program.

Parent Responses

Child-care arrangements -

The parents were questioned about child-care arrangements for their children prior to enrollment in the latch-key program. 31.9% of them were cared for by an older sibling or another relative; 21.6% had a sitter; 13.6% cared

for themselves; and 17% indicated some "other" arrangement.

Self-expectations for the program -

When asked about their expectations for the program, the majority of the parents identified academic and social enrichment as the most important outcomes. 82.6% believed academic enrichment was extremely to very important, and 85.3% viewed social enrichment as extremely to very important. Two other responses were also significant: Relieves anxiety of having child alone, 35.8%; and makes work time more productive, 41.3%.

Over half of the parents thought the following reasons were not important or not applicable: Makes work possible, 54.1%; no need for a sitter, 58%; relieves financial pressure, 61.5%; and no family member must sit, 61.5%.

Perceptions of Attitudes -

The parents were also asked about their childrens' attitudes towards the activities which were to be included in the program. The activities which they thought their children were most positive about (excellent to average) were: Sports, 70.6%; arts and crafts, 60.6%; natural science, 53.2%; computers, 49.5%. The activities which were identified to be of less importance (average to poor) were: Homework, 57.8%; and interest in the library, 56.9%.

The parents believed their children had positive feelings about themselves and related well with their peers. The responses were: 88.9% of the students had excellent to average self-esteem; and 91.8% had excellent to average relationships with friends.

Differences Between Schools -

There were some differences between the responses of the parents in the two schools which were included in the program (see Appendix B and C). The most significant differences were in the perceptions toward learning and self. There were differences in the number of excellent responses between the respondents of the two schools for the following: School grades, a 22.2% difference; a 24.3% difference for attitude toward learning in general; and a 34.4% difference for feelings about self (self-esteem). In each case the responses from the Lincroft school were more positive. However, the majority of responses in all categories at both schools were excellent to average, with three exceptions for the East Keansburg school. Only 31.9% noted excellent to fair school grades; 31.9% excellent to fair interest in the library; and 27.8% excellent to fair self-esteem.

Student Interviews

Continuation of Program -

When a random sampling of students were interviewed at the end of two months, the majority of responses were positive towards the program. Of the 47 students interviewed, 93.6% wanted to have the program continue. A number of them offered reasons why: 25.6% volunteered that it was fun; 19.1% said that it was good because the kids did not have to be home alone, waiting for their parents

to come home from work. A few mentioned that it was better than watching TV; and one or two said it gave them a chance to do their homework.

Positive Comments -

When they were asked what they liked about the program, the following activities were identified: 57.4% cited sports and games; 40.4% liked computers; and 31.9% liked arts and crafts. Other activities that received favorable comments were library, homework, snacks, and "everything."

Negative Comments -

In response to what didn't they like, 46.8% answered "nothing." Few other significant comments were made.

Suggestions for Change -

The final question, "What would you like changed," received 22 suggestions. There were no significant multiple responses for any one idea, but the following suggestions were made by more than one person: Longer periods for the activities; creative writing; photography; wrestling; more sports; more "free" time; and more variety of activities. (See Appendix D)

Discussion

Although the study was incomplete due to the discontinuation of the program, some of the results are noteworthy. The data shows that the majority of children had not been left home alone as a prior arrangement while

their parents worked. Over half of them were cared for by some other family member. Combined with this, the parents' primary expectations for the program were for academic and social enrichment, rather than for care-taking opportunities. Both of these responses indicate that the latchkey program was not considered important primarily as a baby-sitting but rather as an enrichment program.

This fact is further supported by the parents' perceptions of their childrens' preference for activities. They knew their children were most interested in social-type activities, such as sports, arts and crafts and computers. But the parents also recognized that their children would benefit from extra assistance with homework, reading, etc. when they cited interest in academic enrichment as a hoped-for outcome.

The majority of parents believed their children were well-adjusted. This would indicate they did not feel they were having any personal problems, and so would not be an important reason for participation in the program (which also supports their lack of interest in child-care alternatives).

Three differences were noted between the two schools included in the study. At East Keansburg, where the community is less affluent, the parents scored their children 22-34 percentage points lower in school grades, attitudes toward learning, and self-esteem. The comparisons

suggest that parents from less affluent homes are less positive about their childrens' personal and academic abilities.

In the student interviews, the enthusiastic responses of the participants indicates that they thought the program was successful. Their answers were mostly positive, with the greatest interest in sports, arts and crafts, and computers. Also, most of the suggestions made were not meant to alter, but rather to enhance the program.

It was disappointing that the study could not be completed as planned, since much time and energy had been devoted to the study's development and implementation, including the cooperation of the staff, parents and children. However, the results that were analyzed can be viewed as useful. The hypothesis that the children would benefit academically and socially from a latchkey program was partially supported through the children's responses, especially in the area of social enrichment (as they noted the kinds of activities they liked best).

It was not possible to get the parents' reactions to the success of the program, but it appears that they would have been pleased with their children's enthusiasm for the social experiences offered by the program. There was little evidence, however, that there was a change in the students' interest and participation in academic activities. This kind of change would most likely come about over a longer

period of time, and would more likely have been evident by the end of the year.

As the literature indicates, very little research has been done so far to measure the effectiveness of latchkey programs. This study was an effort in that direction. Hopefully, there will be further opportunities to gather this kind of data.

In conclusion, the parents and children of this study viewed the after-school program in a positive light, with high expectations on the part of the parents and praise by the students for the results. This should be encouragement for the Middletown Township school system to resume the program next year, and for others who are considering the implementation of such a program.

Bibliography

Crouter, Ann C. (1982, July-August). "The Children of Working Parents." Children Today, pp. 25-28.

Galambos, N.L., and Dixon, R. (1984, Summer). "Toward Understanding and Caring for Latchkey Children." Child Care Quarterly, pp. 116-125.

Galamos, N.L., and Garbarino, J. (1983, July-August). "Identifying the Missing Links in the Study of Latchkey Children." Children Today, pp. 2-4, 40-41.

Garbarino, James. (1981, February). "Latchkey Children: How Much of a Problem?" The Education Digest, pp. 14-16.

Long, T.J. and Long. L. (1982). "Latchkey Children: The Child's View of Self-care." Washington, D.C. Catholic University of America. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED. 211 229).

Mills, B., and Cooke, E. (1983). "Extended Day Programs - A Place for the Latchkey Child." Early Child Development and Care. Vol. 12, pp. 143-151.

Rodman, H.; Pratto, D.; and Smith-Nelson, R. (1985). "Child Care Arrangements and Children's Functioning: A Comparison of Self-care and Adult-care Children." Development Psychology, 21, No. 3, pp. 413-418.

Stromen, S. H., and Duff, R. E. (1982, November-December). "The Latchkey Child: Whose Responsibility." Childhood Education, pp. 76-79.

Strother, D.D. (1986, January). "Latchkey Children: The Fastest-Growing Special Interest Group in the Schools." Journal of School Health, Vol. 56, No. 1, pp. 13-16.

U.S. Dept. of Labor, Women's Bureau, "Employees and Child Care: Establishing Services Through the Workplace", Pamphlet No. 23, Washington, D.C., August 1982.

Wagner, Mary Lou (1987). "Latchkey Programs: Five Case Studies of After-School Care", Unpublished paper.

Woods, M.B. (1972). "The Unsupervised Child of the Working Mother", Developmental Psychology, 6, 14-25

Appendix A

PARENT ASSESSMENT
LATCH-KEY PROGRAM

Middletown Township Schools

Employed: Yes_____ No_____

If yes, type of employment_____

Number of hours worked per week_____

Number of children enrolled in Latch-Key Program_____

Check appropriate categories among the following:

Single parent home_____ Two parent home_____

Family income: Under $25,000 _____

$25,000 - $50,000 _____

Over $50,000 _____

If employed, child care arrangement prior to this program:

		Number of years
Sitter	_____	_____
Older brother or sister	_____	_____
Self-care	_____	_____
Other relative	_____	_____
Other_____		_____

Self expectations for this program:

Rate each below as it applies to you:

(1) Extremely important
(2) Very important
(3) Mildly important
(4) Not important
(5) Not applicable

		Circle one:				
1.	Academic enrichment for child	1	2	3	4	5
2.	Social enrichment for child	1	2	3	4	5
3.	Makes it possible for me to work	1	2	3	4	5
4.	Eliminates need for sitter	1	2	3	4	5
5.	Relieves financial pressure of paying a sitter	1	2	3	4	5
6.	Frees older child from being a sitter (or other relative)	1	2	3	4	5
7.	Relieves anxiety of having child left alone at home	1	2	3	4	5
8.	Decreases absenteeism at work due to problems with child-care arrangements	1	2	3	4	5
9.	Makes last few working hours in day more productive (less need to call home, worry about child, etc.)	1	2	3	4	5
10.	Other:_____	1	2	3	4	5
	_____					

Perceptions of child's present attitudes

Rate each below as it applies to your child:

(1) Excellent
(2) Fair
(3) Poor

	Circle one
1. School grades	1 2 3
2. Attitude toward attending school	1 2 3
Approximate number of days absent per month_____	
3. Attitude toward homework	1 2 3
4. Attitude toward learning in general	1 2 3
5. Interest and participation in:	
a. Recreation and sports	1 2 3
b. Arts and crafts	1 2 3
c. Mathematics	1 2 3
d. Computers	1 2 3
e. Natural sciences (outdoor nature studies)	1 2 3
f. Library activities (research projects and leisure reading)	1 2 3
Number of books read per month_____	
6. Feelings about self (self-esteem)	1 2 3
7. Relationships with friends	1 2 3
Number of close friends_____	
8. Number of hours per day spent watching television after school_____	

Appendix D

Student Interviews

Representative responses of those who would like the program to be continued:

1. It's really nice.
2. Because it's fun.
3. It's good. The kids don't do something bad out on the streets.
4. Because it's good for the people who go home and don't have someone to stay home with them.
5. It gives me something to do when I get home instead of watching TV.
6. Because it's good for the kids whose parents are home and they have to stay there and wait for them to come home and if I went home I wouldn't really have anything to do.
7. If the mother is working, if we have this program the kids would have some place to stay while the mother is working.
8. So many things to do.
9. You have fun, and you can pick the activities you want to do.
10. Good place to stay until dad gets home.

Representative responses of what they liked about the program:

1. Get to play a lot.
2. Great games and time to do homework.
3. We get to do more than one subject and then get to change every five weeks. Wasn't boring.
4. Sports, arts and crafts, and library.
5. Going to sports and being able to play with my friends in a game where no one would fight, and they would have a supervisor.

Appendix D
Student Interviews (cont'd)

6. Liked subjects, arts and crafts, computers, sports, homework, and stuff.

7. Sports, library, computers very interesting.

8. All the activities.

9. Nice friends, library, reading, computers.

Representative responses of what they did not like about the program:

1. When we can't play - can't go outside.

2. More time for each subject.

3. Didn't like homework.

4. Doing the same stuff over and over.

5. Didn't have enough time at the computers

6. Computers too tough.

7. When kids lost a game they had a lousy attitude

8. Library - can't take books home.

Representative responses of what they would like changed or different:

1. Do whatever I want.

2. I don't think anything should be different.

3. Nothing.

4. Longer periods on playtime, computers, homework, arts and crafts.

5. Put more stuff into it that kids will like.

6. More time on the computers.

7. I would like handwriting - how to write in script.

8. Hot cocoa, not orange juice.

9. Wrestling match.

Appendix D
Student Interviews (cont'd)

10. Go to science instead of library
11. Go home a little earlier.
12. To buy a book in the library.

Feb 23 16:17 1987 latares Page 1

SPSS/PC+ The Statistical Package for IBM PC 2/23/87

ERROR 1, Text:
INVALID COMMAND--Check spelling. If it is intended as a continuation of a previous line, the terminator must not be specified on the previous line. If a DATA LIST is in error, in-line data can also cause this error. This command not executed.

109 cases are written to the uncompressed active file.

This procedure was completed at 17:13:18
The raw data or transformation pass is proceeding
37 cases are written to the uncompressed active file.

***** Memory allows a total of 7409 Values, accumulated across all Variables.
There also may be up to 926 Value Labels for each Variable.

Page 2 LATCH KEY STUDY FALL 1986 2/23/87

V1 ACADEMIC ENRICHMENT

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
EXTREMELY IMPORTANT	1	10	27.0	27.0	27.0
VERY IMPORTANT	2	18	48.6	48.6	75.7
MILDLY IMPORTANT	3	6	16.2	16.2	91.9
NOT IMPORTANT	4	3	8.1	8.1	100.0
	TOTAL	37	100.0	100.0	

Valid Cases 37 Missing Cases 0

Page 3 LATCH KEY STUDY FALL 1986 2/23/87

V2 SOCIAL ENRICHMENT

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
EXTREMELY IMPORTANT	1	17	45.9	45.9	45.9
VERY IMPORTANT	2	14	37.8	37.8	83.8
MILDLY IMPORTANT	3	1	2.7	2.7	86.5
NOT IMPORTANT	4	4	10.8	10.8	97.3
NOT APPLICABLE	5	1	2.7	2.7	100.0
	TOTAL	37	100.0	100.0	

Valid Cases 37 Missing Cases 0

Page 4 LATCH KEY STUDY FALL 1986 2/23/87

V3 MAKES POSSIBLE WORK

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
EXTREMELY IMPORTANT	1	8	21.6	21.6	21.6
VERY IMPORTANT	2	6	16.2	16.2	37.8
MILDLY IMPORTANT	3	10	27.0	27.0	64.9
NOT IMPORTANT	4	2	5.4	5.4	70.3
NOT APPLICABLE	5	11	29.7	29.7	100.0
	TOTAL	37	100.0	100.0	

Valid Cases 37 Missing Cases 0

V4 NO NEED FOR SITTER

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
EXTREMELY IMPORTANT	1	10	27.0	27.0	27.0
VERY IMPORTANT	2	3	8.1	8.1	35.1
MILDLY IMPORTANT	3	11	29.7	29.7	64.9
NOT IMPORTANT	4	2	5.4	5.4	70.3
NOT APPLICABLE	5	11	29.7	29.7	100.0
	TOTAL	37	100.0	100.0	

Valid Cases 37 Missing Cases 0

V5 RELIEVES FINANCIAL PRESSURE

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
EXTREMELY IMPORTANT	1	4	10.8	10.8	10.8
VERY IMPORTANT	2	5	13.5	13.5	24.3
MILDLY IMPORTANT	3	9	24.3	24.3	48.6
NOT IMPORTANT	4	3	8.1	8.1	56.8
NOT APPLICABLE	5	16	43.2	43.2	100.0
	TOTAL	37	100.0	100.0	

Valid Cases 37 Missing Cases 0

V6 NO FAMILY MEMBER MUST SIT

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
EXTREMELY IMPORTANT	1	9	24.3	24.3	24.3
VERY IMPORTANT	2	1	2.7	2.7	27.0

MILDLY IMPORTANT	3	5	13.5	13.5	40.5
NOT IMPORTANT	4	1	2.7	2.7	43.2
NOT APPLICABLE	5	20	54.1	54.1	97.3
NO ANSWER	9	1	2.7	2.7	100.0
	TOTAL	37	100.0	100.0	

Valid Cases 37 Missing Cases 0

Page 8 LATCH KEY STUDY FALL 1986 2/23/87

V7 RELIEVES ANXIETY OF CHILD ALONE

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
EXTREMELY IMPORTANT	1	15	40.5	40.5	40.5
MILDLY IMPORTANT	3	6	16.2	16.2	56.8
NOT APPLICABLE	5	16	43.2	43.2	100.0
	TOTAL	37	100.0	100.0	

Valid Cases 37 Missing Cases 0

Page 9 LATCH KEY STUDY FALL 1986 2/23/87

V8 LESS ABSENTEEISM AT WORK

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
EXTREMELY IMPORTANT	1	8	21.6	21.6	21.6
VERY IMPORTANT	2	1	2.7	2.7	24.3
MILDLY IMPORTANT	3	2	5.4	5.4	29.7
NOT IMPORTANT	4	6	16.2	16.2	45.9
NOT APPLICABLE	5	20	54.1	54.1	100.0
	TOTAL	37	100.0	100.0	

Valid Cases 37 Missing Cases 0

Page 10 LATCH KEY STUDY FALL 1986 2/23/87

V9 WORK TIME MORE PRODUCTIVE

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
EXTREMELY IMPORTANT	1	10	27.0	27.0	27.0
VERY IMPORTANT	2	5	13.5	13.5	40.5
MILDLY IMPORTANT	3	6	16.2	16.2	56.8
NOT IMPORTANT	4	4	10.8	10.8	67.6
NOT APPLICABLE	5	12	32.4	32.4	100.0
	TOTAL	37	100.0	100.0	

Valid Cases 37 **Missing Cases** 0

Page 11 LATCH KEY STUDY FALL 1986 2/23/87

V10

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
	0	25	67.6	67.6	67.6
	1	12	32.4	32.4	100.0
	TOTAL	37	100.0	100.0	

Valid Cases 37 **Missing Cases** 0

Page 12 LATCH KEY STUDY FALL 1986 2/23/87

V11 SCHOOL GRADES

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
EXCELLENT	1	20	54.1	54.1	54.1
FAIR	2	16	43.2	43.2	97.3
POOR	3	1	2.7	2.7	100.0
	TOTAL	37	100.0	100.0	

Valid Cases 37 **Missing Cases** 0

Page 13 LATCH KEY STUDY FALL 1986 2/23/87

V12 ATTITUDE TOWARDS ATTENDING SCHOOL

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
EXCELLENT	1	27	73.0	73.0	73.0
FAIR	2	7	18.9	18.9	91.9
POOR	3	3	8.1	8.1	100.0
	TOTAL	37	100.0	100.0	

Valid Cases 37 **Missing Cases** 0

Page 14 LATCH KEY STUDY FALL 1986 2/23/87

V13 DAYS ABSENT IN MONTH

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
Includes no answer-	0	26	70.3	70.3	70.3
	1	10	27.0	27.0	97.3
	2	1	2.7	2.7	100.0

TOTAL	37	100.0	100.0

Valid Cases 37 Missing Cases 0

Page 15 LATCH KEY STUDY FALL 1986 2/23/87

V14 ATTITUDE TOWARDS HOMEWORK

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
EXCELLENT	1	20	54.1	54.1	54.1
FAIR	2	13	35.1	35.1	89.2
POOR	3	4	10.8	10.8	100.0
	TOTAL	37	100.0	100.0	

Valid Cases 37 Missing Cases 0

Page 16 LATCH KEY STUDY FALL 1986 2/23/87

V15 ATTITUDE TOWARD LEARNING

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
EXCELLENT	1	26	70.3	70.3	70.3
FAIR	2	9	24.3	24.3	94.6
POOR	3	2	5.4	5.4	100.0
	TOTAL	37	100.0	100.0	

Valid Cases 37 Missing Cases 0

Page 17 LATCH KEY STUDY FALL 1986 2/23/87

V16 INTEREST IN SPORTS

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
EXCELLENT	1	31	83.8	83.8	83.8
FAIR	2	2	5.4	5.4	89.2
POOR	3	4	10.8	10.8	100.0
	TOTAL	37	100.0	100.0	

Valid Cases 37 Missing Cases 0

Page 18 LATCH KEY STUDY FALL 1986 2/23/87

V17 INTEREST IN ARTS CRAFTS

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
EXCELLENT	1	20	54.1	54.1	54.1
FAIR	2	12	32.4	32.4	86.5
POOR	3	4	10.8	10.8	97.3
NO ANSWER	9	1	2.7	2.7	100.0
	TOTAL	37	100.0	100.0	

Valid Cases 37 Missing Cases 0

Page 19 LATCH KEY STUDY FALL 1986 2/23/87

V18 INTEREST IN MATH

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
EXCELLENT	1	17	45.9	45.9	45.9
FAIR	2	17	45.9	45.9	91.9
POOR	3	3	8.1	8.1	100.0
	TOTAL	37	100.0	100.0	

Valid Cases 37 Missing Cases 0

Page 20 LATCH KEY STUDY FALL 1986 2/23/87

V19 INTEREST IN COMPUTERS

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
EXCELLENT	1	15	40.5	40.5	40.5
FAIR	2	15	40.5	40.5	81.1
POOR	3	5	13.5	13.5	94.6
NO ANSWER	9	2	5.4	5.4	100.0
	TOTAL	37	100.0	100.0	

Valid Cases 37 Missing Cases 0

Page 21 LATCH KEY STUDY FALL 1986 2/23/87

V20 INTEREST IN NATURAL SCIENCES

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
EXCELLENT	1	19	51.4	51.4	51.4
FAIR	2	14	37.8	37.8	89.2
POOR	3	3	8.1	8.1	97.3
NO ANSWER	9	1	2.7	2.7	100.0
	TOTAL	37	100.0	100.0	

Valid Cases 37 Missing Cases 0

Page 22 LATCH KEY STUDY FALL 1986 2/23/87

V21 INTEREST IN LIBRARY

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
EXCELLENT	1	18	48.6	48.6	48.6
FAIR	2	12	32.4	32.4	81.1
POOR	3	7	18.9	18.9	100.0
	TOTAL	37	100.0	100.0	

Valid Cases 37 Missing Cases 0

Page 23 LATCH KEY STUDY FALL 1986 2/23/87

V22 NUMBER OF BOOKS READ IN MONTH

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
	0	1	2.7	2.7	2.7
	1	2	5.4	5.4	8.1
	2	5	13.5	13.5	21.6
	3	2	5.4	5.4	27.0
	4	9	24.3	24.3	51.4
	5	2	5.4	5.4	56.8
	7	1	2.7	2.7	59.5
	8	1	2.7	2.7	62.2
	10	2	5.4	5.4	67.6
	12	1	2.7	2.7	70.3
	15	1	2.7	2.7	73.0
	20	2	5.4	5.4	78.4
	25	1	2.7	2.7	81.1
	30	1	2.7	2.7	83.8
	70	1	2.7	2.7	86.5
NO ANSWER	99	5	13.5	13.5	100.0
	TOTAL	37	100.0	100.0	

Page 24 LATCH KEY STUDY FALL 1986 2/23/87

V22 NUMBER OF BOOKS READ IN MONTH

Valid Cases 37 Missing Cases 0

- -

V23 FEELINGS ABOUT SELF

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent

EXCELLENT	1	23	62.2	62.2	62.2
FAIR	2	12	32.4	32.4	94.6
POOR	3	2	5.4	5.4	100.0
	TOTAL	37	100.0	100.0	

Valid Cases 37 Missing Cases 0

Page 25 LATCH KEY STUDY FALL 1986 2/23/87

V24 RELATIONSHIP WITH FRIENDS

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
EXCELLENT	1	21	56.8	56.8	56.8
FAIR	2	14	37.8	37.8	94.6
POOR	3	1	2.7	2.7	97.3
NO ANSWER	9	1	2.7	2.7	100.0
	TOTAL	37	100.0	100.0	

Valid Cases 37 Missing Cases 0

Page 26 LATCH KEY STUDY FALL 1986 2/23/87

V25 NUMBER OF CLOSE FRIENDS

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
	1	6	16.2	16.2	16.2
	2	11	29.7	29.7	45.9
	3	6	16.2	16.2	62.2
	4	8	21.6	21.6	83.8
	5	2	5.4	5.4	89.2
	6	1	2.7	2.7	91.9
	8	1	2.7	2.7	94.6
	20	1	2.7	2.7	97.3
NO ANSWER	99	1	2.7	2.7	100.0
	TOTAL	37	100.0	100.0	

Valid Cases 37 Missing Cases 0

Page 27 LATCH KEY STUDY FALL 1986 2/23/87

V26 HOURS WATCHING TV PER DAY

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
	0	3	8.1	8.1	8.1
	1	18	48.6	48.6	56.8
	2	10	27.0	27.0	83.8
	3	2	5.4	5.4	89.2

4	2	5.4	5.4	94.6
5	1	2.7	2.7	97.3
6	1	2.7	2.7	100.0
TOTAL	37	100.0	100.0	

Valid Cases 37 Missing Cases 0

P1 PRIOR SITTER

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
	0	15	53.6	53.6	53.6
Yes - 1	1	13	46.4	46.4	100.0
	TOTAL	28	100.0	100.0	

Valid Cases 28 Missing Cases 0

P2 PRIOR OTHER RELATIVE

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
	0	26	92.9	92.9	92.9
Yes - 1	1	2	7.1	7.1	100.0
	TOTAL	28	100.0	100.0	

Valid Cases 28 Missing Cases 0

This procedure was completed at 17:14:10

Feb 23 16:18 1987 latbres Page 1

SPSS/PC+ The Statistical Package for IBM PC 2/23/87
109 cases are written to the uncompressed active file.

This procedure was completed at 17:15:22
The raw data or transformation pass is proceeding
72 cases are written to the uncompressed active file.

***** Memory allows a total of 7409 Values, accumulated across all Variables.
There also may be up to 926 Value Labels for each Variable.

Page 2 LATCH KEY STUDY FALL 1986 2/23/87

V1 ACADEMIC ENRICHMENT

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
EXTREMELY IMPORTANT	1	41	56.9	56.9	56.9
VERY IMPORTANT	2	21	29.2	29.2	86.1
MILDLY IMPORTANT	3	6	8.3	8.3	94.4
NOT IMPORTANT	4	1	1.4	1.4	95.8
NO ANSWER	9	3	4.2	4.2	100.0
	TOTAL	72	100.0	100.0	

Valid Cases 72 Missing Cases 0

Page 3 LATCH KEY STUDY FALL 1986 2/23/87

V2 SOCIAL ENRICHMENT

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
EXTREMELY IMPORTANT	1	31	43.1	43.1	43.1
VERY IMPORTANT	2	31	43.1	43.1	86.1
MILDLY IMPORTANT	3	5	6.9	6.9	93.1
NOT IMPORTANT	4	1	1.4	1.4	94.4
NOT APPLICABLE	5	1	1.4	1.4	95.8
NO ANSWER	9	3	4.2	4.2	100.0
	TOTAL	72	100.0	100.0	

Valid Cases 72 Missing Cases 0

Page 4 LATCH KEY STUDY FALL 1986 2/23/87

V3 MAKES POSSIBLE WORK

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
EXTREMELY IMPORTANT	1	14	19.4	19.4	19.4
VERY IMPORTANT	2	4	5.6	5.6	25.0

MILDLY IMPORTANT	3	5	6.9	6.9	31.9
NOT IMPORTANT	4	11	15.3	15.3	47.2
NOT APPLICABLE	5	35	48.6	48.6	95.8
NO ANSWER	9	3	4.2	4.2	100.0
	TOTAL	72	100.0	100.0	

Valid Cases 72 Missing Cases 0

Page 5 LATCH KEY STUDY FALL 1986 2/23/87

V4 NO NEED FOR SITTER

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
EXTREMELY IMPORTANT	1	14	19.4	19.4	19.4
VERY IMPORTANT	2	5	6.9	6.9	26.4
MILDLY IMPORTANT	3	4	5.6	5.6	31.9
NOT IMPORTANT	4	10	13.9	13.9	45.8
NOT APPLICABLE	5	35	48.6	48.6	94.4
NO ANSWER	9	4	5.6	5.6	100.0
	TOTAL	72	100.0	100.0	

Valid Cases 72 Missing Cases 0

Page 6 LATCH KEY STUDY FALL 1986 2/23/87

V5 RELIEVES FINANCIAL PRESSURE

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
EXTREMELY IMPORTANT	1	14	19.4	19.4	19.4
VERY IMPORTANT	2	5	6.9	6.9	26.4
MILDLY IMPORTANT	3	1	1.4	1.4	27.8
NOT IMPORTANT	4	7	9.7	9.7	37.5
NOT APPLICABLE	5	41	56.9	56.9	94.4
NO ANSWER	9	4	5.6	5.6	100.0
	TOTAL	72	100.0	100.0	

Valid Cases 72 Missing Cases 0

Page 7 LATCH KEY STUDY FALL 1986 2/23/87

V6 NO FAMILY MEMBER MUST SIT

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
EXTREMELY IMPORTANT	1	12	16.7	16.7	16.7
VERY IMPORTANT	2	5	6.9	6.9	23.6
MILDLY IMPORTANT	3	6	8.3	8.3	31.9
NOT IMPORTANT	4	8	11.1	11.1	43.1

NOT APPLICABLE	5	38	52.8	52.8	95.8
NO ANSWER	9	3	4.2	4.2	100.0
	TOTAL	72	100.0	100.0	

Valid Cases 72 Missing Cases 0

V7 RELIEVES ANXIETY OF CHILD ALONE

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
EXTREMELY IMPORTANT	1	21	29.2	29.2	29.2
VERY IMPORTANT	2	3	4.2	4.2	33.3
NOT IMPORTANT	4	4	5.6	5.6	38.9
NOT APPLICABLE	5	41	56.9	56.9	95.8
NO ANSWER	9	3	4.2	4.2	100.0
	TOTAL	72	100.0	100.0	

Valid Cases 72 Missing Cases 0

V8 LESS ABSENTEEISM AT WORK

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
EXTREMELY IMPORTANT	1	11	15.3	15.3	15.3
VERY IMPORTANT	2	2	2.8	2.8	18.1
MILDLY IMPORTANT	3	9	12.5	12.5	30.6
NOT IMPORTANT	4	6	8.3	8.3	38.9
NOT APPLICABLE	5	40	55.6	55.6	94.4
NO ANSWER	9	4	5.6	5.6	100.0
	TOTAL	72	100.0	100.0	

Valid Cases 72 Missing Cases 0

V9 WORK TIME MORE PRODUCTIVE

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
EXTREMELY IMPORTANT	1	24	33.3	33.3	33.3
VERY IMPORTANT	2	6	8.3	8.3	41.7
MILDLY IMPORTANT	3	1	1.4	1.4	43.1
NOT IMPORTANT	4	5	6.9	6.9	50.0
NOT APPLICABLE	5	31	43.1	43.1	93.1
NO ANSWER	9	5	6.9	6.9	100.0

TOTAL	72	100.0	100.0

Valid Cases 72 Missing Cases 0

Page 11 LATCH KEY STUDY FALL 1986 2/23/87

V10

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
	0	53	73.6	73.6	73.6
	1	19	26.4	26.4	100.0
	TOTAL	72	100.0	100.0	

Valid Cases 72 Missing Cases 0

Page 12 LATCH KEY STUDY FALL 1986 2/23/87

V11 SCHOOL GRADES

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
EXCELLENT	1	23	31.9	31.9	31.9
FAIR	2	44	61.1	61.1	93.1
POOR	3	4	5.6	5.6	98.6
NO ANSWER	9	1	1.4	1.4	100.0
	TOTAL	72	100.0	100.0	

Valid Cases 72 Missing Cases 0

Page 13 LATCH KEY STUDY FALL 1986 2/23/87

V12 ATTITUDE TOWARDS ATTENDING SCHOOL

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
EXCELLENT	1	41	56.9	56.9	56.9
FAIR	2	20	27.8	27.8	84.7
POOR	3	3	4.2	4.2	88.9
NO ANSWER	9	8	11.1	11.1	100.0
	TOTAL	72	100.0	100.0	

Valid Cases 72 Missing Cases 0

Page 14 LATCH KEY STUDY FALL 1986 2/23/87

V13 DAYS ABSENT IN MONTH

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent

Includes no answer -	0	58	80.6	80.6	80.6
	1	8	11.1	11.1	91.7
	2	3	4.2	4.2	95.8
	3	3	4.2	4.2	100.0
	TOTAL	72	100.0	100.0	

Valid Cases 72 Missing Cases 0

Page 15 LATCH KEY STUDY FALL 1986 2/23/87

V14 ATTITUDE TOWARDS HOMEWORK

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
EXCELLENT	1	25	34.7	34.7	34.7
FAIR	2	34	47.2	47.2	81.9
POOR	3	12	16.7	16.7	98.6
NO ANSWER	9	1	1.4	1.4	100.0
	TOTAL	72	100.0	100.0	

Valid Cases 72 Missing Cases 0

Page 16 LATCH KEY STUDY FALL 1986 2/23/87

V15 ATTITUDE TOWARD LEARNING

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
EXCELLENT	1	33	45.8	45.8	45.8
FAIR	2	35	48.6	48.6	94.4
POOR	3	3	4.2	4.2	98.6
NO ANSWER	9	1	1.4	1.4	100.0
	TOTAL	72	100.0	100.0	

Valid Cases 72 Missing Cases 0

Page 17 LATCH KEY STUDY FALL 1986 2/23/87

V16 INTEREST IN SPORTS

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
EXCELLENT	1	46	63.9	63.9	63.9
FAIR	2	20	27.8	27.8	91.7
POOR	3	5	6.9	6.9	98.6
NO ANSWER	9	1	1.4	1.4	100.0
	TOTAL	72	100.0	100.0	

Valid Cases 72 Missing Cases 0

Page 18 LATCH KEY STUDY FALL 1986 2/23/87

V17 INTEREST IN ARTS CRAFTS

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
EXCELLENT	1	46	63.9	63.9	63.9
FAIR	2	23	31.9	31.9	95.8
POOR	3	2	2.8	2.8	98.6
NO ANSWER	9	1	1.4	1.4	100.0
	TOTAL	72	100.0	100.0	

Valid Cases 72 Missing Cases 0

Page 19 LATCH KEY STUDY FALL 1986 2/23/87

V18 INTEREST IN MATH

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
EXCELLENT	1	29	40.3	40.3	40.3
FAIR	2	35	48.6	48.6	88.9
POOR	3	5	6.9	6.9	95.8
NO ANSWER	9	3	4.2	4.2	100.0
	TOTAL	72	100.0	100.0	

Valid Cases 72 Missing Cases 0

Page 20 LATCH KEY STUDY FALL 1986 2/23/87

V19 INTEREST IN COMPUTERS

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
EXCELLENT	1	39	54.2	54.2	54.2
FAIR	2	24	33.3	33.3	87.5
POOR	3	4	5.6	5.6	93.1
NO ANSWER	9	5	6.9	6.9	100.0
	TOTAL	72	100.0	100.0	

Valid Cases 72 Missing Cases 0

Page 21 LATCH KEY STUDY FALL 1986 2/23/87

V20 INTEREST IN NATURAL SCIENCES

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent

EXCELLENT	1	39	54.2	54.2	54.2
FAIR	2	26	36.1	36.1	90.3
POOR	3	2	2.8	2.8	93.1
NO ANSWER	9	5	6.9	6.9	100.0
	TOTAL	72	100.0	100.0	

Valid Cases 72 Missing Cases 0

Page 22 LATCH KEY STUDY FALL 1986 2/23/87

V21 INTEREST IN LIBRARY

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
EXCELLENT	1	23	31.9	31.9	31.9
FAIR	2	38	52.8	52.8	84.7
POOR	3	5	6.9	6.9	91.7
NO ANSWER	9	6	8.3	8.3	100.0
	TOTAL	72	100.0	100.0	

Valid Cases 72 Missing Cases 0

Page 23 LATCH KEY STUDY FALL 1986 2/23/87

V22 NUMBER OF BOOKS READ IN MONTH

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
	1	5	6.9	6.9	6.9
	2	10	13.9	13.9	20.8
	3	10	13.9	13.9	34.7
	4	13	18.1	18.1	52.8
	5	4	5.6	5.6	58.3
	6	2	2.8	2.8	61.1
	8	2	2.8	2.8	63.9
	12	1	1.4	1.4	65.3
	15	1	1.4	1.4	66.7
	20	2	2.8	2.8	69.4
NO ANSWER	99	22	30.6	30.6	100.0
	TOTAL	72	100.0	100.0	

Valid Cases 72 Missing Cases 0

Page 24 LATCH KEY STUDY FALL 1986 2/23/87

V23 FEELINGS ABOUT SELF

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
EXCELLENT	1	20	27.8	27.8	27.8
FAIR	2	42	58.3	58.3	86.1
POOR	3	9	12.5	12.5	98.6
NO ANSWER	9	1	1.4	1.4	100.0
	TOTAL	72	100.0	100.0	

Valid Cases 72 Missing Cases 0

V24 RELATIONSHIP WITH FRIENDS

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
EXCELLENT	1	29	40.3	40.3	40.3
FAIR	2	36	50.0	50.0	90.3
POOR	3	2	2.8	2.8	93.1
NO ANSWER	9	5	6.9	6.9	100.0
	TOTAL	72	100.0	100.0	

Valid Cases 72 Missing Cases 0

V25 NUMBER OF CLOSE FRIENDS

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
	0	4	5.6	5.6	5.6
	1	7	9.7	9.7	15.3
	2	20	27.8	27.8	43.1
	3	15	20.8	20.8	63.9
	4	9	12.5	12.5	76.4
	5	8	11.1	11.1	87.5
	6	1	1.4	1.4	88.9
	7	1	1.4	1.4	90.3
	8	2	2.8	2.8	93.1
	10	1	1.4	1.4	94.4
NO ANSWER	99	4	5.6	5.6	100.0
	TOTAL	72	100.0	100.0	

Valid Cases 72 Missing Cases 0

V26 HOURS WATCHING TV PER DAY

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
	0	4	5.6	5.6	5.6

1	14	19.4	19.4	25.0
2	27	37.5	37.5	62.5
3	17	23.6	23.6	86.1
4	3	4.2	4.2	90.3
5	1	1.4	1.4	91.7
6	1	1.4	1.4	93.1
7	1	1.4	1.4	94.4
9	4	5.6	5.6	100.0
TOTAL	72	100.0	100.0	

Valid Cases 72 Missing Cases 0

INCOME

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
UNDER 25,000	1	31	51.7	51.7	51.7
25,000 - 50,000	2	26	43.3	43.3	95.0
OVER 50,000	3	1	1.7	1.7	96.7
No answer -	9	2	3.3	3.3	100.0
	TOTAL	60	100.0	100.0	

Valid Cases 60 Missing Cases 0

This procedure was completed at 17:16:25